THE

PAPERS

which passed at

NEW-CASTLE

betwixt

HIS SACRED

MAJESTIE

And

M^r. AL. HENDERSON:

Concerning the change of

Church-Government.

Anno Domini 1646.

LONDON.

inted for *R. Royston*, at the *Angel* in *Ivie-lane*. 1649.

FOR
Mr AL. HENDERSON

HIS
MAJESTIES
First Paper.

Fid. Def. Angl. & Sc. Eccl.

After *Henderson*, I Know very well wh
a great Disadvanta
it is for Me to mai
tain an Argument
Divinitie with
able and learned
man as your self,
being your, not M
Profession; whic
really was the cause
& made Me desire to
hear some learned man argue My Opinion wit
you, of whose Abilities I might be confident, tha
I should not be led into an Errour for want
having all which could be said layed open unt
Me: For indeed, My humour is such, that I a
still partial for that side, which I imagine suffe
for the weakness of those that maintain it; a
whyes thinking that equal Champions would ca
the ballance on the other part; Yet since that yo
(thinking that it will save time) desire to go ano
ther way, I shall not contest with you in it, bu
treating you as My Physician, give you leave t
take your own way of cure; onely I thought fi
to warn you, left if you, (not I) should be mist
ken in this, you would be fain (in a manner)
begin anew.

Then know that from My Infancie I was bleſt with the King my Fathers Love, which, I thank God, was an unvaluable happineſſe to Me, all his dayes, and among all his Cares for my Education, his chief was, to ſettle Me right in Religion; in the true Knowledge of which, he made himſelf ſo eminent to all the World, that I am ſure none can call in queſtion the brightneſſe of his Fame in that particular, without ſhewing their own ignorant baſe Malice He it was, who laid in Me the Grounds of Chriſtianitie, which to this day I have been conſtant in; ſo that whether the worthineſſe of My Inſtructour be conſidered, or the not ſeven years that I have been ſeiled in My Principles; it ought to be no ſtrange thing, if it be found no eaſie work, to make me alter them: and the rather, that hitherto, I have (according to S. *Pauls* rule *Rom* 14.22.) been happy in *not condemning my ſelf, in that thing which I allow:* Thus having ſhewed you how, it remains, to tell you what, I believe, in relation to theſe preſent miſerable Diſtractions.

No one thing made me more reverence the Reformation of My Mother, the Church of *England*, than that it was done (according to the *Apoſtles* defence *Act.* 24.18) *neither with multitude, nor with tumult*, but legally and orderly; and by thoſe, whom I conceive to have onely the reforming power; which with many other Inducements made me always confident that the work was very perfect, as to Eſſentials; Of which number Church-government being undoubtedly one, I put no queſtion but that would have been likewiſe altered if there had been cauſe; which opinion of Mine, was ſoon turned into, more than, a confidence, when I perceived, that in this particular (as I muſt ſay of all the reſt) we retained nothing but according as it was deduced from the Apoſtles to be the conſtant univerſal cuſtom of the Primitive Church, and that it was of ſuch conſequence, as by the alteration of it, we ſhould deprive our ſelves of a lawfull Biſhopp, and then, how the Sacraments can be

duly administered, is easie to judge; These ar
the principal Reasons which make Me believe tha
Bishops are necessary for a Church. and, I think
sufficient for Me (if I had no more) not to giv
my consent for their Expulsion out of *England*
but I have another Obligation, that, to my parti
cular, is a no lesse Tie of Conscience; which I
My *Coronation Oath*: Now if (as S. *Paul* saith
Rom 14.22.) *He that doubteth is damned if he eat*
what can I expect if I should not onely give way
knowingly to my Peoples sinning, but likewise b
perjured my self?

Now consider ought I not to *keep my self from*
presumptuous sins? and you know who layes
What doth it profit a man, though he should gai
the whole World, and lose his own Soul? Where
fore my constant maintainance of *Episcopacie* i
England (where there was never any other Go
vernment since Christianitie was in this King
dom) Me thinks, should be rather commended
than wondered at; My Conscience directing m
to maintain the Laws of the Land. Which be
ing onely My endeavours at this time. I desire t
know of you *what warrant there is in the Wor*
of God, for Subjects to endeavour to force their
Kings Conscience? or to make him alter Laws a
gainst his will? If this be not My present case,
shall be glad to be mistaken; or if My Judg
ment in Religion hath been misled all this time,
shall be willing to be better directed: till when
you must excuse M to be constant to the Ground
which the *King my Father* taught Me.

C. R

New-castle,
May 29. 1646.

FOR HIS MAJESTIE.

M. ALEX. HENDERSONS First Paper.

SIR,

1. IT is your Majesties royal goodnesse, and not my merit, that hath made your Majestie to conceive any opinion of my abilities; which (were they worthy of the smalleſt teſtimonie from your Majeſtie) ought in all duty to be improved for your Majeſties ſatisfaction. And this I intended in my coming here at this time, by a free, yet modeſt expreſſion of the true motives and inducements which drew my mind to the diſlike of Epiſcopal Government, wherein I was bred in my younger years at the Univerſitie. Like as I did apprehend that it was not your Majeſties purpoſe to have the Queſtion diſputed by Divines on both ſides; which I would never (to the wronging of the cauſe) have undertaken alone; and which ſeldom or never hath proved an effectuall way, for finding of truth, or moving the minds of Men to relinquiſh their former Tenents, *Dum res tranſit a judicio in affectum*, witneſſe the Polemicks between the Papiſts and us, and among our ſelves, about the matter now in hand, theſe many years paſt.

2. *Sir*, When I conſider your Majeſties education under the hands of ſuch a Father, the length of time wherein your Majeſty hath been ſetled in your Principles of Church-Government, the Arguments which have continually in private and publick, eſpecially of late at *Oxford*, filled your Majeſties ears for the Divine right thereof, your Coronation Oath; and divers State-reaſons which your Majeſtie doth not mention: I do not wonder, nor think it any ſtrange thing, that your Majeſtie hath not at firſt given place to a contrarie impreſſion. I remember that the famous *Joannes*

Pic

Picus Mirandula proveth by irrefragable Reasons (which no rational man will contradict) That no man hath so much power over his own understanding, as to make himself believe what he will, or to think that to be true which his reason telleth him is false; much lesse is it possible for any man to have his reason commanded by the will, or at the pleasure of another.

2. It is a true saying of the School-men, *Voluntas imperat intellectui quoad exercitium, non quoad specificationem*, Mine own will, or the will of another may command me to think upon a matter; but no will or command can constrain me to determin otherwise than my reason teacheth me. Yet *Sir*, I hope your Majestie will acknowledge, (for your Paper professeth no lesse) that according to the saying of *Ambrose*, *Non est pudor ad melora transire*, It is neither sin nor shame to change to the better: *Symmachus* in one of his Epistles (I think to the Emperour *Theodosius* and *Valentinian*) alledgeth all those motives, from education, from prescription of time, from worldly prosperity, and the flourishing condition of the Roman Empire, and from the Laws of the Land, to perswade them to constancie in the ancient Pagan profession of the Romans, against the imbracing of the Christian Faith. The like reasons were used by the Jews for *Moses* against *Christ*; and may be used both for Popery & for the Papacy it self, against the Reformation of Religion and Church-Government; and therefore can have no more strength against a Change now, than they had in former times.

3. But your Majestie may perhaps say, That this is *petitio principii*, and nothing else but the begging of the Question; and I confesse it were so, if there can be no Reasons brought for a Reformation or Change; your Majesty reverences the Reformation of the Church of *England*, as being done legally and orderly, and by those who had the Reforming Power: and I do not deny, but it were to be wisht, that Religion where there is need, were alwayes reformed in that manner, and

by such power, and that it were not committed to the Prelats, who have greatest need to be reformed themselves, not left to the multitudes whom God stirreth up when Princes are negligent: Thus did *Jacob* reform his own Family; *Moses* destroyed the golden Calf, the good Kings of *Judah* reformed the Church in their time: but that such Reformation hath been perfect, I cannot admit. *Asa* took away Idolatries but his Reformation was not perfect; for *Jehosaphat* removed the high Places yet was not his Reformation perfect, for it was *Hezekiah* that brak the brasen Serpent, and *Josiah* destroyed the Idol-Temples who therefore beareth his Elogie, *That like unto him there was no King before him.* It is too well known that the Reformation of K. *Hen.* 8. was most imperfect in the Essentials of Doctrine, Worship and Government; And although it proceeded by some degrees afterward, yet the Government was never reformed, the head was changed, *Dominus non Dominium*; and the whole limbs of the Anti-Christian Hierarchy retained, upon what snares and temptations of Avarice and Ambition, the great Enchanters of the Clergy. I need not expresse. It was a hard saying of *Romanorum Malleus Grosted of Lincoln*, That Reformation was not to be expected, *nisi in ore gladii cruentandi*: yet this I may say, that the *Laodicean* luke-warmnesse of Reformation here hath been matter of continued complaints to many of the Godly in this Kingdom, occasion of more schism and separation than ever was heard of in any other Church; and of unspeakable grief and sorrow to other Churches which God did blesse with greater purity of Reformation. The glory of this great work we hope is reserved for your Majestie that to your comfort and everlasting fame the praise of godly *Josiah* may be made yours; which yet will be no dispraise to your Royal Father, or *Edward* 6. or any other religious Princes before you; none of them having so fair an opportunity as is now by the supreme providence put into your Royal hands. My soul trembleth to think

d to foresee, what may be the event, if this opportunitie be neglected. I will neither use the words of *Mordecai Esth.* 4 14. nor what *Savarola* told another *Charls*, because I hope better things from your Majestie.

4. To the Argument brought by your Majestie which I believe none of your Doctours, had they seen all about you, could more briefly and yet so fully and strongly have expressed) *That nothing is retained in this Church but according as it was deduced from the Apostles to the constant universall practice of the Primitive Church: and that is all of such consequence, as by the alteration of it, we should deprive our selves of the lawfulnesse of Priesthood* (I think your Majestie means a lawfull Ministry) *and then how the Sacraments can be administered, is easie to judge.* I humbly offer these considerations: First what was not in the times of the Apostles, cannot be deduced from them: We say in *Scotland*, It cannot be brought, but it is not the ben; but (not to insist now in a Liturgy, and things of that kind) there was no such Hierarchy, no such difference betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter in the times of the Apostles, and therefore it cannot thence be deduced; for I conceive it to be as clear as if it were written with a sun-beam, that Presbyter and Bishop are in the Apostles one and the same thing, no majority, no inequality or difference of office, power, or degree betwixt the one and the other, but a perfect identity in all. 2. That the Apostles intending to set down the Offices and Officers of the Church, and speaking so often of them and of their gifts and duties, and that not upon occasion, but of set purpose, do neither expresse nor imply any such Pastor or Bishop as hath power over other Pastours. although it be true, that they have distinctly and particularly expresst the office, gifts, and duties of the Officers, such as Deacons. 3. That in the Ministery of the New Testament there is a comely, beautifull, and divine order and subordination, one kind of Ministers both ordinary and extraordinary being placed in degree and

and dignitie one before another, as the Apostles first the Evangelists, Pastors, Doctors &c in their own ranks: but we cannot find in Offices of the same kind that one hath majoritie of power, or priority of degree before another: no Apostle above other Apostles (unlesse in moral respects) no Evangelist above other Evangelists: of Deacon above other Deacons: why then a Pastor above other Pastors? In all other sorts of Ministers ordinarie and extraordinarie a parity in their own kind, onely in ȳ office of Pastor an inequalitie. 4. That the whole power and all the parts of the Ministry, which are commonly called *the power of order and jurisdiction* ware by ȳ Apostles declared to be common to the Presbyter and Bishop: And that *Mat.* 15. 16, 17. the gradation in matter of Discipline or Church-censures, is from one, to two, or more: & if he shall neglect them, tell it to the Church: he saith not, tell it to the Bishop, there is no place left to a retrogradation from more to one, were he never so eminent. If these considerations doe not satisfie, your Majestie may have more, or ȳ same further cleared.

5. Secondly, I do humbly desire Your Majestie to take notice of the fallacy of that Argument, from the practice of the Primitive Church, and the universal consent of ȳ Fathers. It is the Argument of the Papists for such traditions as no Orthodox Divine will admit. The Law & Testimonie must be the Rule. We can have no certain knowledge of the practice universal of ȳ Church for many years, *Eusebius* the prime Historian confesseth so much, The learned *Josephus Scaliger* testifieth, that from the end of the *Acts* of the Apostles until a good time after, no certainty can be had from Ecclesiastical Authors about Church matters. It is true *Diotrephes* sought the preeminence in the Apostles times, and the mystery of iniquitie did then begin to work, and no doubt in after-times some puffed up with Ambition, and others overtaken with weaknesse, endeavoured alteration of Church-Government; but that all the learned and godly of those times consented to such a change as is talked of afterwards, will never be proved.

6. Third-

6. Thirdly, I will never think that your Majestie will denie the lawfulnesse of a Ministery, and the due administration of the Sacraments in the Reformed Churches, which have no Diocesan Bishops, sith it is not onely manifest by Scripture, but a great many of the strongest Champions for Episcopacy, do confesse, that Presbyters may ordain other Presbyters, and that Baptisme administered by a private person, wanting a publick calling, or by a Midwife, and by a Presbyter, although not ordained by a Bishop, are not one and the same thing.

7. Concerning the other Argument taken from Your Majesties Coronation Oath, I confesse, that both in the taking and keeping of an Oath (so sacred a think is it, and so high a point of Religion) much tendernesse is required: and far be it from us, who desire to observe our own Solemn Oath, to presse Your Majestie with the violation of Yours. Yet Sir, I will crave your leave, in all humbleneſse and sincerity to lay before Your Majesties eyes this one thing, (which perhaps might require a larger discourse) that although no humane Authority can dispense with an Oath, *Quia Religio juramenti pertinet ad forum Divinum*, as in some cases it cannot be denied but the obligation of an Oath ceaseth: As when we swear homage and obedience to our Lord and Superiour who afterwards ceaseth to be our Lord and Superiour, for then the formal cause of the Oath is taken away, and therefore the obligation, *Sublata causa tollitur effectus; sublato relato, tollitur correlatum.* Or when any Oath hath a special reference to the benefit of those to whom I make the promise, if we have their desire or consent, the obligation ceaseth; because all such Oaths from the nature of the thing, do include a condition. When the Parliaments of both Kingdoms, have covenanted for the abolishing or altering of a Law, Your Majesties Oath doth not bind You, or Your Conscience to the observing of it; otherwise no Laws could be altered by the Legislative Power. This I conceive hath been the ground

of removing Episcopal Government in *Scotland*, and of removing the Bishops out of the Parliament of *England*. And I assure my self, that Your Majestie did not intend at the taking of Your Oath, that although both Houses of Parliament should find an alteration necessary, although (which God Almighty avert) You should lose Your Self, and Your Posterity, and Crown, that You would never consent to the abolishing of such a Law. If Your Majestie still object, that the matter of the Oath is necessary and immutable; that doth not belong to this, but to the former argument.

8. I have but one word more concerning Your Pietie to Your Royal Father, and teacher of happy Memorie, with which Your Majestie does conclude. Your Majesty knows that King *James* never admitted Episcopacy upon Divine Right; that His Majesty did swear and subscribe to the Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*; that in the Preface of the latter Edition of *Basilicon Doron*, His Majesty gives an honourable testimony to those that loved better the simplicity of the Gospel, than the pomp and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, and that he conceived the Prelats to favour of the Popish Hierarchy, and that (could his Ghost now speak to your Majesty) He would not advise your Majesty to run such hazards for those Men who will chuse rather to pull down your Throne with their own ruin, than that they perish alone. The Lord give your Majesty a wise and discerning Spirit to chuse that in time which is right.

June 3. 1646.

FOR

FOR
Mr. ALEX. HENDERSON,
A Reply to his Answer to my
First Paper, *June* 6.
1646.

His Maiesties *second Paper.*

Mr. *Henderson*,

IF it had been the Honour of the cause which I looked after, I would not have undertaken to put Pen to Paper, or singly to have maintained this Argument against you (whose Answer to my former Paper is sufficient, without other proofs, to justifie my opinion of your abilities) but, it being meerly (as you know) for my particular satisfaction, I assure you that a Disputation of well chosen Divines, would be most effectual; and, I believe you cannot but grant, that I must best know how my self may be best satisfied, for certainly my taste cannot be guided by another's mans Palate, and indeed I will say, that when it comes (as it must) to Probations, I must have either *Persons* or *Books* to clear the Allegations, or it will be impossible to give me satisfaction: The fore-seeing of which, made me at first (for the saving of Time) desire that some of those Divines, which I gave you in a List, might be sent for.

2. Concerning your second Section, I were much too blame, if I should not submit to that saying of *S. Ambrose* which you mention, for I would be unwilling to be found lesse ingenuous than you shew your self to be in the former part of it; wherefore my Reply is, that as I shall not be ashamed *to change for the better*, so I must see that it is *better* before I *change*, otherwise inconstancie in this were both sin and shame, and remember (what your self hath learnedly enforced)

the

that *no mans Reason can be commanded by another mans will.*

3. Your third begins, but I cannot say that it gots on, with that Ingenuity, which the other did; for I doe not understand, how those *Examples* cited out of the Old Testament do any way prove that the way of *Reformation*, which I commend, hath not been the most perfect, or, that any other is lawfull, those having been all by the *Regal Authoritie*; and because *Henry the Eighths Reformation* was not perfect, will it prove that of K. *Edward* and Q. *Elisabeth* to be unperfect? I believe a new *mood* and *figure* must be found out to form a *Syllogism*, whereby to prove that: but however, you are mistaken; for, no man who truely understands the *English Reformation*, will derive it from *Henry the Eighth*; for he onely gave the occasion, it was his *Son* who began, and Q. *Elisabeth* that perfected it; nor did I ever aver, that the beginning of any Humane Action was perfect, no more than you can prove that *God hath ever given approbation to Multitudes to Reform the Negligence of Princes:* For, you know, there is much difference between *Permission*, and *Approbation:* But all this time, I find no *Reasons* (according to your Promise) for a *Reformation* or Change (I mean since Q. *Elisabeths* time.) As for your *Romanorum Malleus* his saying; it is well you come off it with, *yet this I may say*, for it seems to imply, as if you neither ought nor would justifie that *bloudy ungodly saying*: and for your comparing our *Reformation* here to the *Laodicean luke-warm* Asse, proved by *Complaints, Grievings* &c. all that doth, and but unhandsomely, *Petere principium*; nor can Generals satisfie me, for you must first prove, that those men had reason to complain, those Churches to be Grieved, and how we were truely the Causers of this Schism and separation: as for those words which you will not use, I will not answer.

4. Here indeed you truly repeat the first of my two main Arguments; but by your favour, you take (as I conceive) a wrong way to convince me;

is I must make good the *Affirmative*, for I be-
ve a *Negative* cannot be proved; In ſtead of
hich, if you had made appear the *Practice* of the
esbyterian Government in the *Primitive times*,
u had done much; for I doe aver, that this *Go-*
rnment was never Practiſed before *Calvin's*
me; the *Affirmative* of which, I leave you to
ove; My taſk being to ſhew the *lawfulneſſe* and
ceſſion of Epiſcopacy and as I believe the *neceſſi-*
of it: For doing whereof, I muſt have ſuch
ooks as I ſhall call for; which poſſibly upon
ruſal, may one way or other, give me ſatisfacti-
n; but I cannot abſolutely promiſe it, without
e Aſſiſtance of ſome learned Man, whom I can
uſt, to find out all ſuch Citations, as I have uſe
: wherefore blame me not, if time be unneceſ-
rily loſt.

5. Now for the *fallaciouſneſſe* of my *Argument*
o my knowledge) it was never my *practice*, nor
oe I confeſſe to have b gun now; For if the
ractice of the *Primitive Church*, and the *univer-*
l conſent of the Fathers be not a convincing *Ar-*
ment, when the *Interpretation* of *Scripture* is
oubtfull, I know nothing; For, if this be not,
hen of *neceſſity* the *Interpretation of private Spi-*
ts muſt be admitted: the which contradicts Saint
eter, 2. *Pet.* 1. 20. is the *Mother* of all *Sects*, and
ill (if not prevented) bring theſe *Kingdoms* into
nfuſion: And to ſay that an Argument is ill, be-
uſe the *Papiſts* uſe it, or, that ſuch a thing is
ood, becauſe it is the Cuſtom of *ſome* of the *Re-*
rmed Churches: cannot weigh with me, untill
ou prove, theſe to be *infallible*; or that to main-
in *no Truth*: And how *Diotrephes ambition* (who
rectly oppoſed the *Apoſtle S. John*) can be an Ar-
ument againſt *Epiſcopacy*, I doe not underſtand.

6. When I am made a *Judge* over the *Reformed*
hurches, then, and not before, will I cenſure their
Actions: as you muſt prove, before I confeſſe it,
hat *Presbyters without a Biſhop*, *may lawfully or-*
dain other Presbyters: And as for the Adminiſtra-
ion of *Baptiſm*, as I think none will ſay, that a
Woman can lawfully, or Duly adminiſter it,

thou-

though when done, it be *valid*: so none ought doe it, but a lawfull *Presbyter*: whom you do not deny, but to be absolutely necessary for the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*.

7 You make a learned succinct discourse of *Oaths* in general, and their several *Obligation* to which I fully agree: intending, in the particular now in question, to be guided by your own *Rule*, which is, *when any Oath hath a special reference to the Benefit of those to whom I make the Promise, if we have their desire, or consent, the Obligation ceaseth*. Now, it must be known to whom this Oath hath reference, and to *whose Benefit*? The Answer is clear, onely to the *Church of England*, as by the *Record* will be plainly made appear: and you much mistake in alleaging that the two *Houses of Parliament* (especially as they are now constituted) can have this *Disobligatory Power* for (besides that they are not named in it) I am confident to make it clearly appear to you, that this *Church* never did submit, nor was subordinate to them, and that it was onely the *King and Clergy*, who made the *Reformation*, the *Parliament* meerly serving to help to give the *Civil sanction*: all this being proved (of which I make no question) it must necessarily follow that it is onely the *Church of England* (in whose favour I took this Oath) that can release me from it: wherefore when the *Church of England* (being lawfully Assembled) shall declare that I am free then, and not before, I shall esteem my self so.

8 To your last concerning the *King my Father* of happie and famous Memorie both for his *Piety* and *Learning*: I must tell you, that I had the happinesse, to know him much better than you; wherefore I desire you, not to be too confident in the knowledge of his Opinions: For I dare say, should his *Ghost now speak* he would tell you that a *Bloudy Reformation* was never lawfull, as not warranted by *Gods word*, and that *Preces & lachrymæ sunt Arma Ecclesiæ*

9 To conclude, having replied to all your Paper, I cannot but observe to you, that you have

me no Answer to my last *Quere*: it may be re (as *Chaucer* saves) like the *People of Eng- what they not like, they never understand*: in earnest that *Question* is so pertinent to the pose in hand that it will much serve for my sfaction: and besides it may be usefull for r things.

C. R.

New-castle,
me 6. 1646.

FOR

FOR HIS MAjESTIE

Mr. AL. HENDERSON

Second Paper.

SIR,

THe ſmaller the encouragements be, in rela to the ſucceſſe, (which how ſmall they your Majeſty well knows:) the more appar and, I hope, the more acceptable will my ob ence be, in that which in all humility I now g bout, at your Majeſties Command: yet wh conſider, that the way of man is not in himſ nor is it in man that walketh, to direct his ſteps; and when I remember how many ſuppl tions, with ſtrong crying and tears, have bee penly and in ſecret offered up in your Maje behalf, unto God that heareth prayer, I have reaſon to deſpaire of a bleſſed ſucceſſe.

1. I have been averſe, from a diſputation of vines, 1. For ſaving of time, which the Pre exigence and extremity of affairs, make more t ordinarily pretious; While *Archimedes* at *Sy cuſe* was drawing his Figures and Circlings the ſand, *Marcellus* interrupted his demonſtra 2. Becauſe the common reſult of Diſputes of kind, anſwerable to the prejudicate opinions the Parties, is rather Victory then Verity; wh *tanquam tentativi Dialectici*, they ſtudy mor overcome their adverſe Party, than to be ov come of Truth, although this be the moſt glori Victory. 3. When I was commanded to co hither, no ſuch thing was propoſed to me, nor pected by me. I never judged ſo meanly of Cauſe, nor ſo highly of my ſelf, as to ventur

such weakneſſe. Much more might be ſpo-
o this purpoſe; but I forbear.

I will not further trouble your Majeſty with
which is contained in the ſecond Section,
g that your Majeſty will no more inſiſt up-
ducation, preſcription of Time, &c. which are
ient to prevent Admiration, but (which your
ſty acknowledges) muſt give place to Rea-
and are no ſure ground of reſolution of our
, in any point to be believed: although it be
that the moſt part of men make theſe and
ke to be the ground and rule of their Faith:
vidence, that their Faith is not a Divine
, but an humane Credulity.

Concerning *Reformation of Religion* in the
Section; I had need of a Preface to ſo thor-
Theam, as your Majeſty hath brought me
; 1. For *the Reforming power*; it is concei-
when a General defection, like a deluge,
covered the whole face of the Church, ſo
ſcarcely the tops of the Mountains do ap-
a General Councel is neceſſary, but, be-
that can hardly be obtained, ſeveral King-
(which we ſee was done, at the time of the
rmation) are to reform themſelves, and
by the Authority of their Prince, and Magi-
es: if the Prince or ſupreme Magiſtrate
willing, then may the inferior Magiſtrate,
the People, being before rightly informed in
grounds of Religion, lawfully Reform, with-
eir own Sphere; and if the light ſhine upon
or the major part, they may, after all other
s aſſayed, make a Publick Reformation.
, before this time, I never wrote or ſpoke; yet
Maintainers of this Doctrine, conceive that
are able to make it good. But, *Sir*, were I
thy to give advice to Your Majeſty, or to the
s and ſupreme Powers on Earth, my humble
nion would be, that they ſhould draw the
ds, tongues, and pens of the learned, to diſ-
about other matter, than the power or Prero-
ve of Kings and Princes; and in this kind,
Majeſty hath ſuffered and loſt more, than

will

will easily be restored to your self or your Po
rity, for a long time. It is not denied but the pr
Reforming power is in Kings and Princes, &
bus deficientibus, it comes to the inferior
giftrate. *Quibus Deficientibus*, it descendeth
the Body of the People; supposing that there
necessity of Reformation, and that by no mean
can be obtained of their Superiors. It is true th
such a Reformation, is more imperfect in resp
of the Instruments and manner of Procedure;
for the most part more pure and perfect in re
tion to the effect and product. And for this e
did I cite the Examples of old of Reformation
Regal Authority; of which none was perfect,
the second way of perfection, except that of
siah Concerning the saying of *Grostead*, who
the *Cardinals at Rome* confest to be a mo
Godly man, than any of themselves; it was
Complaint and Prediction of what was likely
ensue, not his desire or Election. If Reformati
could have been obtained, in the ordinary way.
might bring two unpartial Witnesses, *Jewel* a
Jilson, both famous English Bishops, to pro
that the tumults and troubles raised in *Scotla*
at the time of Reformation, are to be imputed
the Papists opposing of the Reformation, both o
doctrine and Discipline, as an Heretical Inn
vation; and not to be ascribed to the Nobility,
people, who under God were the Instruments
it; intending and seeking nothing but the pu
ging out of Errour, and setling of the Truth
2. Concerning the Reformation of the Church
England. I conceive, whether it was begun
not, in K *Henry* the 8. time, it was not finish
by Q *Elisabeth*: the Father stirred the humou
of the diseased Church; but neither the So
nor the Daughter (although we have great rea
son to bless God for both) did purge them out per
fectly: This Perfection is yet reserved for your
Majesty: Where it is said; *that all this time I
bring no Reasons for a further Change*; th
fourth Section of my last Paper, hath many hint
of Reasons against Episcopal Government, with

ffer of more, or clearing of those; which Majesty hath not thought fit to take notice And learned men have observed many De- in that Reformation: As that the Govern- of the Church of *England*, (for about this e question now is not builded upon the foun- on of Christ and the Apostles; which they, st cannot deny, who professe Church-Go- ment to be Mutable and Ambulatory; and were the greater part of Archbishops and ops in *England*; contenting themselves with Constitutions of the Church, and the Autho- and Munificence of Princes, till of late, that few have pleaded it to be *Jure Divino* t the *English* Reformation hath not perfectly ged out the *Roman* Leaven; which is one of Reasons, that have given ground to the com- ing of this Church, to the Church of *Lao- as being neither hot nor cold, neither Po- not Retormed, but of a luke-warm temper ixt the two: That it hath depraved the cipline of the Church, by conforming of it to Civil Policy: That it hath added many ch Offices higher and lower, unto those tuted by the Son of God; which is as unlaw- s to take away Offices warranted by the Di- Institution: And other the like, which have ed some to apply this saying, to the Church of land. *Multi ad perfectionem pervenirent, n se pervenisse crederent*

In my Answer to the first of your Majesties Arguments, I brought a Breviate of some ons to prove, *that a Bishop and Presbyter, e and the same in Scripture*: from which, necessary consequence I did infer the *nega- Therefore* no difference in Scripture be- en a Bishop and a Presbyter; the one name ifying, *Industriam Curæ Pastoralis*; the o- *Sapientiæ Maturitatem*, saith *Beda* And reas your Majesty averres, that *Presbyteri- Government was never practised before vin's time*, your Majesty knows, the common ction of the Papists, against the Reformed

Churches

Churches; where was your Church, your Reformation, your Doctrine, before *Luther's* time? One part of the common Answer is, *that it was from the beginning; and is to be found in Scripture*: The same I affirm of Presbyterian-Government: And for proving of this, the *Assembly of Divines* at *Westminster* have made manifest, that *the Primitive Christian Church of Jerusalem was governed by a Presbytery*: while they shew, 1. That the Church of *Jerusalem* consisted of more Congregations than one, from the multitude of Believers, from the many Apostles, and other Preachers in that Church, and from the diversity of Languages among the Believers. 2. That all these Congregations were under one Presbyterial Government, because they were, for Government, one Church, *Acts* 11. 22, 26. And because that Church was governed by Elders, *Acts* 11. 30. which were Elders of that Church, and did meet together for Acts of Government: And the Apostles themselves in that meeting, *Acts* 15. acted not as Apostles, but as Elders; stating the question, debating it in the ordinary way of disputation; and having by search of Scripture, found the will of God, they conclude, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and us*: which in the judgement of the learned, may be spoken by any Assembly, upon like evidence of Scripture. The like Presbyterian Government had place in the Churches of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Thessalonica*, &c. in the times of the Apostles, and after them, for many years, when one of the Presbytery was made *Episcopus Praeses*, even then, *Communi Presbyterorum Consilio, Ecclesiæ gubernabantur*, saith *Jerome*; & *Episcopos magis consuetudine, quam Dispositionis Divinæ veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, & in Communi debere Ecclesiam regere*.

5. Far be it from me to think such a thought as that your Majesty did intend any Fallacy, in your other main Argument, from Antiquity. As we are to distinguish betwixt *Intentio Operantis* &

& *Conditio Operis*; so may we in this case consider the difference between *Intentio Argumentantis*, & *Conditio Argumenti*. And where your Majesty argues, that, if your Opinion be not admitted, we will be forced to give place to the *Interpretation of private Spirits*, which is contrary to the Doctrine of the Apostle *Peter*, and will prove to be of dangerous consequence; I humbly offer to be considered by Your Majesty, that some of chief note among the *Papists* themselves have taught us, That the *Interpretation of Scriptures*, and the *Spirits* whence they proceed, may be called *private*, in a threefold sense. 1. *Ratione Personæ*, if the Interpreter be of a private condition. 2. *Ratione Modi & Mediis*, when Persons, although not private, use not the publick means which are necessary for finding out the Truth, but follow their own fancies. 3. *Ratione finis*, when the Interpretation is not proposed as Authentical to bind others, but is intended onely for our own private satisfaction. The first is not to be despised; the second is to be exploded, and is condemned by the Apostle *Peter*; the third ought not to be censured: But that every Interpretation which is Authentical, and of Supreme Authority, which even mans conscience is bound to yeild unto, is of an higher nature. And, although the General Councel should resolve it, and the Consent of the Fathers should be had unto it, yet there must alwayes be place left to the Judgement of Discretion, as *Davenant* late Bishop of *Salisbury*, beside divers others, hath learnedly made appear in his Book, *De Judice Controversiarum*; where also the Power of Kings in matter of Religion, is solidly and unpartially determined. Two words onely I adde, one is, that notwithstanding all that is pretended from Antiquity, a Bishop having sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, will never be found in *Primæ Antiquity*. The other is, that many of the Fathers did, unwittingly, bring forth that *Antichrist* which was conceived in the times of the Apostles, and therefore are incompetent Judges

in the Question of *Hierarchie*. And upon the other part, the Lights of the Christian Church, at, and since the beginning of the Reformation, have discovered many secrets, concerning the *Antichrist* and his *Hierarchie*, which were not known to former Ages: And divers of the learned, in the Roman Church, have not feared to pronounce, That, whosoever denies the true and literal sense of many Texts of Scripture, to have been found out in this last Age, is unthankfull to God, who hath so plentifully poured forth his Spirit upon the Children of this Generation, and ungratefull towards those men, who with so great pains, so happy successe, and so much benefit to Gods Church, have travailed therein: This might be instanced in many places of Scripture: I wind together *Diotrephes* and the *Mysterie of Iniquitie*, the one, as an old example of Church-ambition, which also was too palpable in the Apostles themselves; And the other as a cover of Ambition afterwards discovered; which two, brought forth the *great Mysterie* of the Papacie at last.

6. Although your Majestie be not made a Judge of the Reformed Churches, yet you so far censure them and their actions, as, without Bishops, in your judgement, they cannot have a lawfull Ministerie, nor a due Administration of the Sacraments: Against which dangerous and destructive Opinion, I did alledge what I supposed, your Majestie would not have denied, 1. That Presbyters without a Bishop, may Ordain other Presbyters. 2. That, Baptism, administered by such a Presbyter, is another thing than Baptism administered by a private Person, or by a Mid-wife. Of the first your Majestie calls for proof: I told before, that in Scripture, it is manifest, 1 *Tim.* 4 14. *Neglect not the Gift that is in Thee, which was given Thee by the Prophesie, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbyterie*; so it is in the English Translation: And the word *Presbyterie*, so often as it is used in the New Testament, alwayes signifies the *Persons*, and not the *Office*. And although the Offices of Bishop, and Presbyter were

distinct

distinct; yet doth not the Presbyter derive his power of Order, from the Bishop. The Evangelists were inferiour to the Apostles, yet had they their power, not from the Apostles, but from Christ: The same I affirm of the seventy Disciples, who had their power immediately from Christ, no lesse than the Apostles had theirs. I may upon better reason be averred, that the Bishops have their power from the Pope, than that Presbyters have their power from the Prelats. It is true, *Jerome* saith, *Quid facit, excepta ordinatione Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter*; but in the same place he proves from Scripture, that *Episcopus & Presbyter* are one and the same; and therefore when he appropriates Ordination to the Bishop, he speaks of the degenerated custom of his time. 2. Concerning Baptism, a private person may perform the external Actions and Rites both of it and of the Eucharist; yet is neither of the two a Sacrament, or hath any efficacie, unlesse it be done by him that is lawfully called thereunto, or by a person made publick and clothed with Authority by Ordination. This Errour in the matter of Baptism, is begot by another Errour, of the absolute necessitie of Baptism.

7. To that which hath been said, concerning his Majesties Oath, I shall adde nothing; not being willing to enter upon the Question, of the Subordination of the Church to the Civil Power, whether to King, or Parliament, or both, and to either of them, in their own place. Such an Headship as the Kings of *England* have claimed, and such a Supremacie as the Houses of Parliament have, with Appeals from the supreme Ecclesiasticall Judicature to them as set over the Church, in the same line of Subordination, I do utterly disclaim upon such Reasons as give my self satisfaction, although no man shall be more willing to submit to Civil Powers, each one in their own sphere; and more unwilling to make any trouble in my self: Onely concerning the application of the Generals of an Oath, to the particular case now in hand; under favour, I conceive not how

the Clergie of the Church of *England*, is, t
ought to be principally intended, in your Oath
Rot, although they were esteemed to be the Re-
presentative Church, yet even that is for the bene-
fit of the Church Collective, *Salus Populi*, being
Suprema Lex, and to be principally intended.
Your Majestie knows it was so in the Church of
Scotland, where the like Alteration was made.
And, if nothing of this kind can be done with-
out the consent of the Clergie, what Reformati
can be expected in *France*, or *Spain*, or *Rome* i
self? It is not to be expected, that the Pope,
Prelate will consent to their own ruin.

8. I will not presume upon any secret know-
ledge of the Opinions held by the King, your Ma-
jesties Father, of famous Memorie; they bei
much better known to your Majestie. I did one
produce, what was profest by him, before th
World: And although Prayers and Tears be th
Arms of the Church; yet, it is neither acceptabl
to God, nor conducible for Kings and Prince
to force the Church to put on these Arms: Ne
could I ever hear a Reason, why a necessary De-
fensive War against unjust Violence is unlaw
full, although it be joyned with Offence and In-
vasion which is pretended for Defence, but
that Arms are layed down when the Offensiv
War ceaseth: by which it doth appear, that th
War on the other side, was in the nature thereo
Defensive.

7. Concerning the forcing of Conscienc
which I pretermitted in my other Paper, I a
forced now, but without forcing my Conscienc
to speak of. Our Conscience may be said to b
forced; either by our selves, or by others. I
our selves. 1. When we stop the ear of our Con-
science and will not hearken, or give place
information, resolving obstinately. *Ne si per-
suaseris, persuadebis*; which is no lesse than a re-
sisting of the holy Ghost, and the hardening
our hearts. 2. Or when we stop the mouth an
suppresse the clamours of our Conscience, r
solving rather to suffer the Worm to gnaw, an

the fire to burn inwardly, than to make profeſſion of that we are convinced to be Truth. 3. Or when we ſear our Conſcience, as with an hot Iron, that it becometh ſenſleſſe; which is the puniſhment of the former: unto which is oppoſed, the truly tender Conſcience; ſuch as *Joſiah* had, 2 Kings 22.19. Again, 1. Our Conſcience is ſaid to be forced by others; when they obtrude upon us what is in it ſelf evil and unlawfull; which if we admit, againſt our own Conſcience, we ſin, two wayes; one is, by doing that which is in it ſelf evil and unlawfull; the other is, by doing it againſt a dictate of Conſcience, which is a contempt of God, whoſe Vicegerent it is. 2. Or when others urge us to do that which is in it ſelf good, or may lawfully be done, but through Errour of Conſcience we judge it to be evil, and unlawfull: in this caſe, if we do not that which is preſt upon us, we ſin, becauſe the thing is good and lawfull: And if we do it, we ſin; becauſe we do againſt our Conſcience. Which in this caſe bindeth but obligeth not: And yet there is a way to eſcape out of this labyrinth, it being repugnant to the equitie of the will of God to lay a Neceſſitie of ſinning upon any man: the onely way is, to lay aſide ſuch a Conſcience; it being a part of the Old man: Which we are commanded to put off; otherwiſe, we being ſufficiently informed, and yet cleaving to our old Errour, we rather do violence to our Conſcience our ſelves than ſuffer violence from others. The Application, for Anſwering the *Quere*, I leave to your Majeſtie.

New-caſtle,
June 17. 1646.

FOR
Mr. AL. HENDERSON.
In Reply to his second Paper, *June* 22. 1646.

His MAJESTIES Third Paper.

1. IT were arrogance, besides losse of time, in Me to vie *preambles* with you; For, it is *truth* I seek, and neither *praise*, nor *victorie*; wherefore I shall onely insist upon those things which are meerly necessary to mine own satisfaction; in order to which, I desired the *assistance* of some *Divines*; whereupon I will insist no further, save onely to wish, that you may not (as I have known many men do) *lose* time by being mistaken in the way to *save* it; wherein I have onely sought to disburden my self, but to lay no blame upon you, and so I leave it.

2. Nor will I say more of the second than of this, that I am glad you have so well approved of what I have said concerning my *Education* and *Reason*; but then remember, that *another mans will*, is at least, as weak a ground, to build my Faith upon, as my former *Education*.

3. In this there are two points, First, concerning the *Reforming Power*, then anent the *English Reformation*; For the first, I confesse you now speak clearly, which before you did but darkly mention, wherein I shall mainly differ with you, untill you shall shew me better reason: yet thus far I will go along with you, that when a *General Councel* cannot be had, several *Kingdoms* may *reform* themselves, (which is learnedly and fully proved by the late *Archbishop of Canterbury* in his Disputation against *Fisher*) but; that the *inferiour Magistrates* or *People* (take it which way you will) have this *Power*, I utterly deny; For which,

by

by your favour, you have made no sufficient proof, to my judgement: Indeed, if you could have brought, or can bring Authoritie of Scripture, for this opinion, I would and will yet, with all reverence submit; but as for *your Examples out of the Old Testament*, in my mind, they rather make for, than against me, all those *Reformations* being made by *Kings*; and it is a good *probable* (though I will not say *convincing*) *Argument*, that if God would have approved of a *popular reforming way*, there were *Kings* of *Judah* and *Israel* sufficiently negligent and ill to have made such examples by; but by the contrary, the 16. *Chap.* of *Numbers* shews clearly, how God *disapproves* of such courses: but I forget, this Assertion is to be proved by you; yet I may put you in the way, wherefore let me tell you; that this *pretended Power* in the *People*, must (as all others) either be directly, or else declaratorily by approbation, given by God; which, how soon you can do, I submit; Otherwise you prove nothing: For the citing of private mens Opinions (more than they concurre with *the general consent of the Church* in their time) weighs little with me, it being too well known, that *Rebels never wanted Writers to maintain their unjust Actions*; and though I much reverence Bishop *Jewels* memorie, I never thought him *infallible*, for *Bilson* I remember well what opinion the *King* my *Father* had of him for those Opinions: and how he shewed him some favour in hope of his *Recantation*, as his good nature made him do many things of that kind; but whether he did, or not, I cannot say: To conclude this point, untill you shall prove this *Position* by the *Word of God*, (as I will *Regal Authoritie*) I shall think all *Popular Reformation*, little better than *Rebellions*; for, I hold that *no Authoritie is lawfull but that which is either directly given, or at least approved by God*. 2. Concerning the *English Reformation*, the fifth Reason you bring why Q. *Elisabeth* did not finish it, is *because she took not away Episcopacy*, the *hints of reason against which Government*, you say, *I take no no-*

side of; now I thought it was sufficient notice, yea, and answer too, when I told you, *A negative* (as I conceived) *could not be proved*, and that it was for me to prove the *affirmative*; which I shall either do, or yield the Argument as soon as I shall be assisted with *Books*, or such *Men* of my opinion, who, like you, have a Librarie in their brain: And so I must leave this particular, untill I be furnished with *means* to put it to an *issue*; which had been sooner done, if I could have had my will: Indeed, your second well proved, is most sufficient, which is, that *the English Church-Government is not builded upon the Foundation of Christ and the Apostles*; but I conceive your probation of this, doubly defective; for first, albeit our *Archbishops* and *Bishops* should have professed *Church government* to be *mutable and ambulatory*, I conceive it not sufficient to prove your Assertion: and secondly, I am confident you cannot prove, that most of them maintained this *walking* position, (for some particulars must not conclude the general) for which you must find much better Arguments than their being content with the *constitution of the Church*, and the *authority* and *munificence of Princes*, or you will fall extremely short: As for the *retaining* of *the Roman leven*, you must prove it, as well as say it, else you say little: But that the conforming of the *Church-discipline* to the *Civil policy*, should be a depraving of it, I absolutely deny; for I aver, that without it, the *Church* can neither flourish, nor be happy: And for your last instance, you shall do well to shew the prohibition of our *Saviour* against addition of more Officers in the *Church* than he named; and yet in one sense I do not conceive that the *Church of England* hath added any; for, an *Archbishop* is onely a distinction for *Order* of *Government*, not a *new Officer*, and so of the rest; and of this kind, I believe there are divers now in *Scotland*, which you will not condemn, as the *Moderatours of Assemblies*, and others.

4. Where you find a *Bishop*, and *Presbyter* in Scripture, to be one and the same (which I deny

to

to be alwayes so) it is in the *Apostles time*; now I think to prove the Order of *Bishops* succeeded that of the *Apostles*, and that the name was chiefly altered, in reverence to those who were immediatly chosen by our *Saviour*, (albeit in their time they caused divers to be called so, as *Barnabas* and others) so that, I believe, that this Argument makes little for you: As for your proof of the Antiquitie of *Presbyterian Government* it is well that the *Assembly of Divines at Westminster* can do more than *Eusebius* could, and I shall believe, when I see it; for, your former Paper affirms, that those Times were very dark for matter of fact, and will be so still for me, if there be no clearer Arguments to prove it, than those you mention: for, because there were *divers Congregations in Jerusalem*; ergo, *what?* Are there not *divers Parishes in one Diocess?* (your two first I answer but as one Argument) and because the *Apostles met with those of the inferiour Orders, for Acts of Government*, what then? even so in the Times do the *Deans and Chapters*, and many times those of the *inferiour Clergy* assist the *Bishops*; but I hope you will not pretend to say, that there was an equalitie between *the Apostles and other Presbyters*, which not being doth (in my judgement) quite invalidate these Argumeuts: And if you can say no more for the *Churches of Corinth, Ephesus, Thessalonica, &c.* than you have for *Jerusalem*, it will gain no ground on me; As for S. *Jerome*, it is well known that he was no great Friend to *Bishops*, as being none himself, yet take him altogether, and you will find that he makes a clear distinction between a *Bishop* and a *Presbyter*, as your self confesses; but the truth is, he was angry with those who maintained *Deacons* to be equal to *Presbyters*.

5. I am well satisfied with the explanation of your meaning concerning the word *Fallacy*, though I think to have had reason for saying what I did: But by your favour, I do not conceive that you have answerd the strength of my Argument, for when you and I differ upon the *interpreta-*

tion of Scripture, and I appeal to the *practice* of the *Primitive Church*, and *the universal consent of the Fathers*, to be judge between us, me thinks you should either find a fitter, or submit to what I offer; neither of which (to my understanding) you have yet done; nor have you shewn how, waving those Judges I appeal unto, the mischiefs of the interpretation by *private spirits*, can be prevented. Indeed, if I cannot prove by *antiquity*, that *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* belongs to *Bishops* (thereby clearly distinguishing them from other *Presbyters*) I shall then begin to misdoubt many of my former *foundations*; (as for Bishop *Davenant*, he is none of those, to whom I have appealed, or will submit unto) but for the exception you take to *Fathers*, I take it to be a *begging of the Question*; as likewise those great discoveries of secrets, not known to former Ages, I shall call *new invented fansies* untill particularly you shall prove the contrary; and for your *Roman Authours*, it is no great wonder for them to seek shifts whereby to maintain *Novelties*, as well as the *Puritans*: As for *Church-ambition*, it doth not at all terminate, in seeking to be *Pope*; for, I take it to be no point of humilitie to endeavour to be *independent of Kings*, it being possible, that *Papacy* in a *multitude* may be as dangerous as in one.

6. As I am no *Judge* over the *Reformed Churches*: so neither do I censure them, for many things may be avowable upon *necessity*, which otherwayes are *unlawfull*; but know once for all, that I esteem nothing the better because it is done by such a *particular Church*, (though it were by the *Church of England*, which I avow most to reverence) but I esteem that *Church* most, which comes nearest to the *purity of the primitive Doctrine and Discipline*, as I believe this doth: Now concerning *Ordination*, I bad you prove that *Presbyters* without a *Bishop* might lawfully *ordain*, which yet I conceive you have not done; For 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. it is evident that S. *Paul* was at *Timothies* ordination; And albeit that all the *seventy* had

their

their power immediately from *Christ*, yet it is as evident that our Saviour made a clear distinction between the *twelve Apostles* and the rest of the *Disciples*, which is set down by three of the *Evangelists*, whereof Sanit *Mark* calls it an *Ordination*, *Mark* 3.15. and S. *Luke* sayes, *And of them he chose Twelve*, &c. *Luke* 6.13. onely S. *Matthew* doth but barely enumerate them by their name of distinction, *Matth.* 10 1. I suppose out of modestie, himself being one, and the other two being none are more particular: For *the administration of Baptism*, giving, but not not granting what you say, it makes more for me than you: but I will not engage upon new questions, not necessary for my purpose.

7. For my *Oath*, you do well not to enter upon those questions you mention; and you had done as well to have omitted your instance; but, out of discretion, I desire you to collect your Answer out of the last Section: and for your Argument, though the intention of my Oath be for the good of the *Church collective*, therefore can I be dispensed withall by others than the *Representative Body*? Certainly, no more than the People can dispense with me for any *Oaths* I took in their favours, without the two *Houses of Parliament*; as for future Reformations, I will onely tell you, that *Incommodum non solvit Argumentum.*

8. For the *King* my *Fathers* opinion, if it were not to spend time (as I believe) needlesly, I could prove by living and written testimonies, all, and more, than I have said of him, for his perswasion in these points which I now maintain; and for your *Defensive War*, as I do acknowledge it a great sin for any *King* to *oppresse the Church*, so I hold it absolutely unlawfull for *Subjects* (upon any pretence whatsoever) to make *War* (though *defensive*) against their *lawfull Sovereign*; against which no lesse proofs will make me yeild but *Gods Word*; and let me tell you, that upon such points as these *instances*, as well as *comparisons* are *odious*.

9. Lastly, you mistake the *Quote* in my first Pa-

pers

per to which this pretends to answer; for my question was not concerning *force of Arguments* (for I never doubted the lawfulnesse of it) but *force of Arms*, to which, I conceive it sayes little or nothing, unlesse (after my example) you refer me to the former Section; that which it doth, is meerly the *asking of the Question*, after a fine discourse of the several ways of *perswading* rather than *forcing* of conscience: I close up this Paper, desiring you to take notice, that there is none of these Sections, but I could have enlarged to many more lines, some to whole pages; yet I chose to be thus brief, knowing you will understand more by a word than others by a long discourse; trusting likewise to your ingenuitie, that *reason epitomized*, will weigh as much with you as if it were at large.

C. R.

June 22. 1646.

FOR

HIS MAJESTIE,

Concerning the Authority of the Fathers, and practice of the Church. *July* 2. 1646.

Mr. AL. HENDERSONS *Third Paper.*

HAving in my former Papers pressed the steps of your Majesties Propositions, and finding by your Majesties last Paper, Controversies to be multiplied (I believe) beyond your Majesties intentions in the beginning; As concerning the *Reforming Power*: The *Reformation of the Church of England*; The *difference betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter*; The *warrants of Presbyterian Govern-*

ments;

ment; The *Authority of Interpreting Scripture*, The *taking and keeping of Publick Oaths*; The *forcing of Conscience*, and many other inferiour and subordinate questions, which are Branches of those main Controversies: All which in a satisfactory manner to determin in few words, I leave to more presuming Spirits, who either see no knots of Difficulties, or can find a way rather to cut them asunder, than to unloose them: yet will I not use any Tergiversation; nor do I decline to offer my humble Opinion with the Reasons thereof, in the own time concerning each of them; which in obedience to your Majesties command, I have begun to do already. Onely Sir, by your Majesties favourable permission, for the greater expedition, and that the present v.litations may be brought to some issue, I am bold to entreat that the Method may be a little altered, and I may have leave now to begin at a Principle, and that which should have been, *inter Precognita*; I mean the Rule, by which we are to proceed, and to determin the present Controversie of *Church policy*; without which we will be led into a labyrinth, and want a thred to wind us out again. In your Majesties first Paper, the *universal custom of the Primitive Church*, is conceived to be the Rule. In the second Paper, Section the 5. The *practise* of the *Primitive Church*, and the *universal consent of the Fathers*, is made a convincing Argument, when the *Interpretation of Scripture* is doubtfull: In your third Paper, Sect. 5. *the practice of the Primitive Church, and the universal consens of the Fathers*, is made Judge; and I know, that nothing is more ordinary in this question, than to alledge *Antiquity perpetual Succession, universal Consens of the Fathers*, and the *universal practise* of the *Primitive Church*, according to the Rule of *Augustine*, *Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec a Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est non, nisi Authoritate Apostolica, traditum rectissime creditur*. There is in this Argument at the first view, so much appear-

ance

ance of Reason, that it may much work upon a modest mind; yet being well examined and rightly weighed, it will be found to be of no great weight; for beside that the minor will never be made good in the behalf of a *Diocesan Bishop*, having sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, there being a multitude of Fathers, who maintain that *Bishop and Presbyter are of one and the same Order*; I shall humbly offer some few Considerations about the major, because it hath been an inlet to many dangerous Errours, and hath proved a mighty hinderance and obstruction to Reformation of Religion.

1. First, I desire it may be considered, that whiles some make two Rules for defining Controversies; the word of God and antiquity, (which they will have to be received with equal veneration) or, as the Papists call them, *Canonical Authority*, and *Catholical Tradition*; and others, make *Scripture* to be the onely *Rule*, and *Antiquity* the authentick *Interpreter*; the latter of the two seems to me to be the greater errour: because the first setteth up a *parallel*, in the same degree with Scripture; but this would create a Superiour, in a higher degree above Scripture: for the *interpretation* of the Fathers shall be the *Iudge*, and accounted the very Cause and Reason for which we conceive and believe such a place of Scripture to have such a sence, and thus men shall have Dominion over our Faith, against 1 *Cor.* 1. 24. Our faith shall stand in the wisdom of men, and not in the power of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. 5. and Scripture shall be of private interpretation; For the Prophesie came not of old by the will of man, 2 *Pet.* 1. 20. 22. *Nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non fuerit; Homo jam Deo propitius esse debebit*, saith Tertullian.

2. That Scripture cannot be Authentically interpreted but by Scripture, is manifest from Scripture: The Levites gave the sense of the Law by no other means, but by Scripture it self, *Neh.* 8. 8. Our Saviour for example to us, gave the true sense of Scripture, against the depravations of Satan,

Satan, by comparing Scripture with Scripture, and not by alleaging any Testimonies out of the Rabbins, *Matt.* 4. And the Apostles, in their Epistles used no other help, but the diligent comparing of Prophetical writings; like as the Apostle *Peter*, will have us to compare the clearer light of the Apostles, with the more obscure light of the Prophets, 2. *Pet.* 1. 19 And when we betake our selves to the Fathers, we have need to take heed, that, with the Papists, we accuse not the Scriptures of obscurity or imperfection.

3. The Fathers themselves (as they are cited by Protestant Writers) hold this Conclusion, that Scripture is not to be interpreted, but by Scripture it self: To this purpose, amongst many other Testimonies, they bring the saying of *Tertullian*, *Surge veritas, ipsa Scripturas tuas interpretaro quam Consuetudo non novit, nam si nosset, non esset*: if it knew Scripture, it would be ashamed of it self, and cease to be any more.

4. That some Errours have been received, and continued for a long time, in the Church: The Errour of *Free will* beginning at *Justin Martyr*, continued till the time of *Reformation*, although it was rejected by *Augustine*, as the *Divine Right of Episcopacy* was opposed by others. The Errour about the *Vision of God*. That *the Souls of the Saints departed, see not the face of God, till the Judgement of the Great Day*, was held by universal Consent: the same may be said of the errour of the Millenaryes, and, which more nearly toucheth upon the present question, the Ancients erred grosly about the *Antichrist* and *Mystery of Iniquity*, which did begin to work in the dayes of the Apostles. Many other instances might be brought to prove the *universal practice of the Church*, as were not warranted by the Apostles, as in the Rites of *Baptism* and *Prayer*, and the forming up and drawing together of the Articles of that Creed, that is called *Symbolum Apostolicum*, the observation of many *Feasts* and *Fasts*, both Anniversary and Weekly.

5. T

5. That it is not a matter so incredible, or impossible, as some would have it appear to be, for the Primitive Church to have made a sudden defection from the Apostolical purity: The people of *Israel*, in the short time of *Moses* his absence on the Mount, turned aside quickly, and fell into horrible Idolatry, *Exod.* 32. soon after the death of *Josuah*, and the Elders that had seen the great works, which the Lord had done for *Israel*, there arose another Generation after them, which did evil in the sight of the Lord, *Judg.* 2 & 7. soon after the building of the Temple, and setling of Religion by *David* and *Solomon*, the worship of God was defiled with Idolatry: when *Rehoboam* had established the Kingdom, he forsook the Law of the Lord, and all *Israel* with him. 2 *Chron.* 12. 1. And the Apostle sayes to the Galatians, *Gal.* 1. 6. *I marvel that you are so soon removed unto another Gospel*: why then shall we think it strange, that in the matter of Discipline, there should be a sudden defection, especially it being begun in the time of the Apostles? I know it is a common Opinion, but I believe there be no strong reasons for it, that the Church which was nearest the times of the Apostles was the most pure and perfect Church.

6. That it is impossible to come to the knowledge of the Universal Consent and Practice of the Primitive Church: for many of the Fathers wrote nothing at all, many of their writings are perished, (it may be that both of these have dissented from the rest) many of the Writings which we have under their names are supposititius, and counterfeit, especially about Episcopacy which was the foundation of Papal Primacy: The Rule of *Augustine* afore-mentioned doth too much favour Traditions, and is not to be admitted, without cautions and exceptions.

Many the like Considerations may be added, but these may be sufficient to prove, that the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, and the universall practice of the Primitive Church, is no sure ground of Authentical interpretation of Scripture.

ture. I remember of a grave Divine in *Scotland*, much honoured by King *James* of happy memory, who did often profesſe that he did learn more of one Page of *John Calvin*, then of a whole Treatiſe of *Auguſtine*: nor can there be any good reaſon, (many there be againſt it) why the Ancients ſhould be ſo far preferred to the Modern Doctours of the Reformed Churches, and the one in a manner Deified, and the other vilified: It is but a poor Reaſon that ſome give, *Fama miſtrix ſenioris ævi*, and is abundantly anſwered by the Apologiſt for Divine Providence. If your Majeſty be ſtill unſatisfied concerning the Rule, I know not to what purpoſe I ſhould proceed or trouble your Majeſty any more.

New-caſtle,
July 2. 1646.

FOR

FOR
Mr. AL. HENDERSON,
July 3. 1646.

HIS MAJESTIES
Fourth Paper.

I shall very willingly follow the *method* you have begun in your third Paper, but I do not conceive that My last Paper multiplies more Controversies than my first gave occasion for; having been so far from augmenting the Heads of our Disputation, that I have omitted the answering many things, in both your Papers, expresly to avoid raising of new and needlesse *Questions*; desiring to have only so many debated, as are simply necessary to shew, whether or not, *I may with a safe conscience give way to the alteration of Church-Government in* England; and indeed I like very well, to begin with the *setling of the Rule*, by which we are to proceed and determin the present *Controversie*: to which purpose (as I conceive) my third Paper shews you an excellent way; for there, I offer you a *Judge* between us, or desire you to *find out a better*: which, to my judgement, you have not yet done, (though you have sought to invalidate Mine) For, if you understand to have offered the *Scripture*, though no man shall pay more reverence, nor submit more humbly to it, than my self; yet we must find some rule to judge betwixt us, when you and I differ upon the *interpretation* of the self-same Text, or it can never determin our questions, as for example, I say you misapply that of 2. *Corinthians* 1. 24. to me (let others answer for themselves) for I know not how I make *other men to have domi-*

nion over my Faith, when I make them onely serve to approve my reason; nor do I conceive how, 1 Corinthians 2. 5. can be applied to this purpose; For there Saint Paul onely shews the difference between *Divine* and *Humane Eloquence*, making no mention of any kind of *interpretation* throughout the whole Chapter, as indeed Saint *Peter* does, 2 *Peter* 1. 20. which I conceive makes for me; for, since that no *Prophesie of Scripture is of any private interpretation*; First, I infer, that *Scripture* is to be *Interpreted*; for else, the *Apostle* would have omitted the word *Private*: Secondly, that at least the consent of many learned Divines is necessary, and so *a fortiore*, that of the *Catholick Church*, ought to be an *authentick Judge*, when men differ: And is it a good Argument? because (*Matth.* 4. 4, 7, 10.) Scripture is best interpreted by it self, therefore that all other interpretations are unlawful? certainly you cannot think: Thus having shewed you that we differ, about the *meaning* of the Scripture, and are like to do so: certainly there ought to be for this, as well as other things, a *Rule* or a *Judge* between us, to determin our differences, or, at least, to make our Probations and Arguments *Relevant*: therefore evading, for this time, to Answer your 6 *Considerations* (not I assure you for the difficulty of them, but the starting of new questions) I desire you onely to shew me a better, than what I have offered unto you.

C. R.

New-castle,
July 3. 1646.

FOR

FOR Mr. ALEX. HENDERSON, A particular Answer to Mr. AL. HENDERSONS, *July* 3, 16. 1646.

HIS MAJESTIES Fifth Paper.

UNtill you shall find out a *fitter way* to decide our *Difference* in Opinion concerning *Interpretation of Scripture* than the *Consent of the Fathers, and the universal Practice of the Primitive Church*, I cannot but passe you my Judgement anent those 6 *Considerations*, which you offered to invalidate those Authorities, that I so much reverence.

1. In the first you mention *two Rules for defining of Controversies*, and seek a most old way to confute them, as I think: For you alledge, that *there is more attributed to them*, than I believe you can prove, by the Consent of most learned men (there being no question, but there are always some flattering Fools that can commend nothing but with hyperbolick expressions) and you know that *supposito quolibet, sequitur quidlibet*, besides do you think, that albeit some ignorant Fellows, should attribute more power to *Presbyters*, than is really due unto them, that thereby their just reverence and authority is diminished? So I see no reason why I may not safely mainrain that the *Interpretation of Fathers*, is a most excellent *strengthning* to my Opinion, though Others should attribute the *Cause* and *Reason* of their Faith unto it.

2. As there is no question, but that *Scripture* is far *best Interpreter* of it self, so I see nothing

thing in this, negatively proved, to exclude any other, notwithstanding your positive affirmation.

3 Nor in the next, for I hope you will not be the first to condemn your self, me, and innumerable Others, who yet unblamably have not tyed themselves to this Rule.

4. If in this you onely intend to prove, that *Errours* were alwaies *breeding in the Church*, I shall not deny it, yet that makes little (as I conceive) to your purpose; but if your meaning be, to accuse the *Universal Practice of the Church* with *Errour*, I must say it is a very bold undertaking, and (if you cannot justifie your self by clear places in Scripture) much to be blamed, wherein you must not alledge, that to be universally received which was not, as I dare say, that the *Controversie about Free will*, was never yet decided, by *Oecumenical*, or *General Councels*; nor must you presume to call that an *Errour*, which really the *Catholick Church* maintained (as in *Rites of Baptism, Forms of Prayer, Observation of Feasts, Fasts*, &c.) except you can prove it so by the Word of God, and it is not enough to say, that such a thing was not warranted by the *Apostles*, but you must prove by their *Doctrine*, that such a thing was *unlawfull*, or else the *Practice of the Church* is warrant enough for me to follow and obey that Custom, whatsoever it be and think it good, and shall believe that the *Apostles Creed* was made by them, (such *Reverence* I bear to the *Churches Tradition*) untill other Authors be certainly found out.

5. I was taught that *de posse ad esse* was no good Argument; and indeed to me it is incredible, that any *custom of the Catholick Church* was erroneous which was not contradicted, by *Orthodox*, learned men, in the times of their first Practice, as is easily perceived that all those *Defections* were, (some of them may be justly called *Rebellions*) which you mention.

6. I deny it is *impossible*, (though I confesse it *difficult*) to come to the knowledge of the *Universal Consent*, and *Practice of the Primitive*

Church

[illegible] I therefore I confesse a man ought to be [illegible] to believe things of this nature, [illegible] I conceive this to be onely an Argu- [illegible] *Caution*.

My Conclusion is, that albeit I never esteemed [illegible] *Authority* equal to the *Scriptures*, yet I do [illegible] the *Unanimous Consent of the Fathers*, and [illegible] *Universal Practice of the Primitive Church*, [illegible] *the best and most Authentical Interpreters of* [illegible] and consequently the fittest Judges [illegible] and you, when we differ, until you [illegible] better: For example, I think you for [illegible] present, the best *Preacher* in *New-Castle*, yet [illegible] you may erre, and possibly a better [illegible] may come, but till then, must retain my [illegible]

C. R.

New-castle,
July 16. 1646.

FINIS.

238254

1

Jane Rollin